

Davidson.Ray

From: Campbell.Malcolm
Sent: September 26, 2019 11:33 AM
To: Hickey.Donna
Subject: FW: Add privacy sentence to WP application form

Hi Donna, please update our Privacy Risk Action Plan accordingly.
Risk # 5 I think.

IPG Workers Unit agreed to the change. GCMS Change requested submitted Sept 26 with Intake Request #514354.
Thanks,

From: Campbell.Malcolm
Sent: September 26, 2019 11:30 AM
To: Thaine.Marcia
Cc: Leconte.Verlyne ; Santini.Neida ; Paterson.Scott ; Hickey.Donna ; IPG ADMIN Worker Unit / Unité des travailleurs ADMIN OPI (IRCC)
Subject: RE: Add privacy sentence to WP application form

Hi Marcia,
Thanks, the CR was just submitted: Intake Request #514354

If you require anything else, just let me know.
Malcolm

From: Thaine.Marcia
Sent: September 25, 2019 2:57 PM
To: Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Leconte.Verlyne <Verlyne.Leconte@cic.gc.ca>; Santini.Neida <Neida.Santini@cic.gc.ca>; Paterson.Scott <Scott.Paterson@cic.gc.ca>; Hickey.Donna <Donna.Hickey@cic.gc.ca>; IPG ADMIN Worker Unit / Unité des travailleurs ADMIN OPI (IRCC) <IRCC.IPGADMINWorkerUnit-UnitedestravailleursADMINOPI.IRCC@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: Add privacy sentence to WP application form

Hi Malcolm,
Please see below the answer to your question.

Question:

The TRV (IMM5257) and SP (IMM1294) have the following sentence on the application but the WP (IMM1295) does not. The sentence was specifically added for analytics, which is why it wasn't added for WPs at the same time. Now that we are going through our Chinook Privacy Risk Assessment action plan, ATIP are recommending that sentence be added to the WP form as well.

The personal information collected on an application, and other information collected in support of an application, may be used for decision making, including your application. Personal information, including from computer analytics, may also be used for evaluation, internal audit, compliance, risk management, strategy development and reporting.

Answer:

The Workers team in TRPD agrees to add those lines to the Privacy statement on the IMM 1295 **and** the IMM 5710 applications (both in and outside of Canada).

Please confirm that you will initiate the GCMS CR, as these are 2D bar code forms, and we will sign off on CR.

Regards,
Marcia Thaine

Senior Policy and Program Advisor, Immigration Program Guidance
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Marcia.Thaine@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 343-550-1767

Conseillère principale en programmes, Orientation du programme d'immigration
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Marcia.Thaine@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 343-550-1767

From: Campbell.Malcolm

Sent: September 23, 2019 8:30 AM

To: MacFarlane.Melissa <Melissa.MacFarlane@cic.gc.ca>

Cc: Paterson.Scott <Scott.Paterson@cic.gc.ca>; Hickey.Donna <Donna.Hickey@cic.gc.ca>

Subject: Add privacy sentence to WP application form

Hi Melissa,

I'm wondering if you can point me in the right direction to whoever is in charge of the WP form at IPG. The TRV (IMM5257) and SP (IMM1294) have this sentence on the application but the WP (IMM1295) does not.

The sentence was specifically added for analytics which is why it wasn't added for WPs at the same time.

Now that we are going through our Chinook Privacy Risk Assessment action plan, ATIP are recommending that sentence be added to the WP form as well.

The personal information collected on an application, and other information collected in support of an application, may be used for decision making, including your application. Personal information, including from computer analytics, may also be used for evaluation, internal audit, compliance, risk management, strategy development and reporting.

Thanks,

Malcolm Campbell

Senior Analyst | Analyste principal

Strategic Planning and Delivery | Planification stratégique et exécution

International Network | Réseau international

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada | Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada

Government of Canada | Gouvernement du Canada

malcolm.campbell@cic.gc.ca

Davidson.Ray

From: Oickle.Natasha
Sent: November 29, 2019 7:22 AM
To: Campbell.Malcolm; Vezina.Alain; Hickey.Donna
Subject: FW: Question about M5 Information Sharing MOUs

then there should be no issue with including it in Chinook as an indicator.

Natasha Oickle

Business Expert, International Network
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 873-408-0580

Expert Fonctionnelle, Réseau international
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 873-408-0580

From: Fleck.Jordon
Sent: November 28, 2019 3:11 PM
To: Oickle.Natasha
Cc: International Info / Info Internationale (IRCC)
Subject: RE: Question about M5 Information Sharing MOUs

Hi Natasha, and thanks for CC'ing us Brad.

I can't say that we've ever received a question like this before, but we are very much in support of the guidance provided by Admissibility below. The MOUs do state

In those instances it would be our guidance to seek clarification from the individual who provided the information. It would be very unfortunate if we were to make an assumption and ended up under classifying the information. Should the provider respond stating that they're unsure of the information's classification, then it would be reasonable for a Risk Assessment Officer to apply some type of classification by using IRCC's own instruments.
Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have additional questions, or require assistance obtaining a classification level from the partner country.

Jordon Fleck

Senior Program Advisor, Immigration Program Guidance
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Jordon.Fleck@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 613-297-3222

Conseiller principal de programme, Orientation du programme d'immigration
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Jordon.Fleck@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 613-297-3222

From: Oickle.Natasha
Sent: November 28, 2019 11:00 AM
To: Fleck.Jordon <Jordon.Fleck@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: Question about M5 Information Sharing MOUs
Good morning Jordan,

Just wanted to follow up on the message below. Have you received a similar question in the past and is there additional guidance you can provide?

Essentially, can Risk Assessment Officers determine the classification/designation of information from an M5 partner if the classification is not specified by that partner?

Thanks,
Natasha Oickle

Business Expert, International Network
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 873-408-0580

Expert Fonctionnelle, Réseau international
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 873-408-0580

From: Oickle.Natasha
Sent: November 20, 2019 3:06 PM
To: International Info / Info Internationale (IRCC) <IRCC.InternationalInfo-InfoInternationale.IRCC@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Fleck.Jordon <Jordon.Fleck@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: Question about M5 Information Sharing MOUs

Thank you very much for the fulsome response, Brad. I appreciate your help.
Jordan, if you have time for a quick call about this topic either this week or next, please let me know. It may help to go over some of the context to see if there is additional guidance you might be able to provide.
Kind regards,
Natasha Oickle

Business Expert, International Network
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 873-408-0580

Réseau international
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 873-408-0580

From: International Info / Info Internationale (IRCC)
Sent: November 20, 2019 2:56 PM
To: Oickle.Natasha <Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Fleck.Jordon <Jordon.Fleck@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: Question about M5 Information Sharing MOUs

Hello Natasha,
Apologies for the delayed response. The information sharing arrangements between IRCC and

We interpret this to mean that it is the

Two things:

- 1) The suite of " " information sharing agreements/arrangements are less prescriptive on this question than those for " " but we can assume that the same principle applies " " and, " " and,
- 2) All MOUs are silent on

I've copied my IPG colleague, Jordon Fleck, to see if IPG has received similar questions to this in the past, and if so, what guidance was provided.

Again, apologies for the delayed response.

Thank you,

Brad.

From: CIC-Infosharing-echangedinformation

Sent: November 15, 2019 3:55 PM

To: Oickle.Natasha <Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca>; International Info / Info Internationale (IRCC) <IRCC.InternationalInfo-InfoInternationale.IRCC@cic.gc.ca>

Subject: FW: Question about M5 Information Sharing MOUs

Good afternoon Natasha,

Forwarding your question to the Admissibility branch who are responsible for providing policy guidance on information sharing with M5 partners.

Thank you.

From: Oickle.Natasha

Sent: November 15, 2019 3:26 PM

To: CIC-Infosharing-echangedinformation <CIC-Infosharing-echangedinformation@cic.gc.ca>

Subject: Question about M5 Information Sharing MOUs

Good afternoon,

I am hoping you may be able to help answer a question that I have about the information sharing MOUs that IRCC has with M5 partners. When information is shared by an M5 country with IRCC, is IRCC always responsible for determining the classification or designation of the information if not specified by the M5 partner? Are there any cases in which the receiver of the information would not be responsible for determining the classification or designation?

As an example, if a Risk Assessment Officer overseas receives information about a fraud trend from an M5 partner, which has information that- if collected by IRCC- would be considered Protected B, can the Risk Assessment Officer determine that the information is of a Protected B designation?

I appreciate your help in clarifying. If this question should be directed to a different group, please let me know.

Thank you,

Natasha Oickle

Analyst, International Network

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada

Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 873-408-0580

Analyste, Réseau international

Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada

Natasha.Oickle@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 873-408-0580

Davidson.Ray

From: Daponte.Andie
Sent: February 24, 2020 10:59 AM
To: Catana.Lisa
Cc: Davis.Ken; Campbell.Malcolm; LaSalle.Joelle; Manhas.Davinder; Mpaka.Manzi-Serge
Subject: RE: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Categories: Refusal Notes

Hi All,

let's finish that review first and send IPG a copy of the final notes for comments. We will end up in an endless cycle of revisions otherwise.

Also note that coders have limited time to get Chinook v1 complete before summer rotation and possible other changes with Chinook IT governance, so we have to prioritize what is possible in that time frame.

Andie Daponte

Director, International Network
 Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 613-437-9931

Directeur, Réseau international
 Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 613-437-9931

From: Austin.Carly
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2020 10:55 AM
To: Catana.Lisa ; Daponte.Andie
Cc: Davis.Ken ; Campbell.Malcolm ; LaSalle.Joelle
Subject: RE: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Hi Lisa,

I'm referring to GCMS notes, but you'll have to set notes in GCMS for officers to choose from. I had assumed that there were

Thanks for this clarification. We're putting forward a CR to make amendments to the TR refusal grounds based on feedback from missions as well as LMD. This is in the early stages and we plan to consult widely as we go through the process. It'd be great to ensure that the TR refusal ground notes that you're working on for Chinook are consistent with the changes we're putting forward with the refusal ground CR.

Would it be possible to review the notes before you make the changes in Chinook?

Carly Austin

Senior Program and Policy Advisor, Immigration Program Guidance
 Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
[\(343\) 551-1438](mailto:Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca)

Conseiller principal des programmes, Orientation du programme d'immigration
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca / (343) 551-1438

s.23

From: Catana.Lisa
Sent: February 20, 2020 10:08 AM
To: Austin.Carly <Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca>; Daponte.Andie <Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Davis.Ken <Ken.Davis@cic.gc.ca>; Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>; LaSalle.Joelle <Joelle.LaSalle@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Hi Carly,

Can you clarify what you mean by what's currently in GCMS?

Are you referring to the refusal grounds?

For refusals, Chinook facilitates the officer's entry of:

- 1) **Refusal Notes** that will be pasted into the Notes Tab.
- 2) **Refusal Grounds** – the list of refusal grounds in Chinook matches that in GCMS. We do not/cannot amend these refusal grounds, we are merely facilitating entry into GCMS.
The refusal grounds then trigger boiler plate text that populates the Refusal Letter (which we also do not/cannot amend from Chinook)

Hope that makes sense,

L

From: Austin.Carly
Sent: February 20, 2020 10:04 AM
To: Daponte.Andie <Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca>; Catana.Lisa <Lisa.Catana@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Davis.Ken <Ken.Davis@cic.gc.ca>; Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>; LaSalle.Joelle <Joelle.LaSalle@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Thanks Lisa and Andie for putting this into context. I wasn't aware that IN had been working on revising the notes. We've been in touch with LMD specifically in regards to the [redacted] refusal ground. Would it be possible to be looped in to the suggested wording changes before they're finalized and submitted to the coding team?

Also, just to better understand, will the changes that you're making to the notes in Chinook supersede what's currently in GCMS?

Carly Austin

Senior Program and Policy Advisor, Immigration Program Guidance
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca / (343) 551-1438

Conseiller principal des programmes, Orientation du programme d'immigration
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca / (343) 551-1438

s.19(1)

L'information divulguée en vertu de la loi sur l'accès à l'information

s.21(1)(b)

From: Daponte.Andie**Sent:** February 20, 2020 9:54 AM**To:** Catana.Lisa <Lisa.Catana@cic.gc.ca>; Austin.Carly <Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca>**Cc:** Davis.Ken <Ken.Davis@cic.gc.ca>; Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>; LaSalle.Joelle <Joelle.LaSalle@cic.gc.ca>**Subject:** RE: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Hi All,

We are having a couple of IN staff review the response received from CMB. Once we have final comments included, the plan is to go back to the coding team to have adjustments made.

It is very unlikely these changes would be made in time for the journey lab work, but as Lisa points out the goal would be for all required changes across all parts of Chinook (so not just the refusal wordings, but everything) to be in place for June.

Joelle, when you are back let's consolidate the IN comments and discuss with Chinook coding team.

Andie Daponte

Director, International Network

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada

Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 613-437-9931

Directeur, Réseau international

Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada

Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 613-437-9931

From: Catana.Lisa**Sent:** Thursday, February 20, 2020 9:18 AM**To:** Austin.Carly <Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca>**Cc:** Davis.Ken <Ken.Davis@cic.gc.ca>; Daponte.Andie <Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca>; Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>**Subject:** RE: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Hi Carly,

Ken just looped me into this.

Great to see that wording has been provided for the TR refusal notes – I know Malcolm has been working with Litigation for a while.

Looping in Andie,

Given the consultations that Malcolm has conducted over the last year, these changes are probably better handled by the Chinook team as part of the

The lab is deploying our new tools on Tuesday and so our scope/timelines are pretty tight.

Happy to discuss further,

L

From: Austin.Carly
Sent: February 19, 2020 3:29 PM
To: Davis.Ken <Ken.Davis@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Rello.Natalia <Natalia.Rello@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: FW: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Hi Ken,

Thanks again for chatting this morning. This is the email that CMB had sent to IN that I had mentioned. I'm not sure what the consultation process has been in terms of the notes in Chinook, but it would be so great to at least modify the note for the TR refusal ground on if there's still time.

We'd be happy to chat about this anytime!

Carly Austin

Senior Program and Policy Advisor, Immigration Program Guidance
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca / (343) 551-1438

Conseiller principal des programmes, Orientation du programme d'immigration
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca / (343) 551-1438

From: Taljit.Gary
Sent: February 17, 2020 6:54 PM
To: Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>; LaSalle.Joelle <Joelle.LaSalle@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Daponte.Andie <Andie.Daponte@cic.gc.ca>; Manhas.Davinder <Davinder.Manhas@cic.gc.ca>; Parnham.Carina <Carina.Parnham@cic.gc.ca>; Hamilton.Karen <Karen.Hamilton@cic.gc.ca>; Bourassa.Carrie-Anne <Carrie-Anne.Bourassa@cic.gc.ca>; Datoo.Noorani <Noorani.Datoo@cic.gc.ca>; Austin.Carly <Carly.Austin@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: LMD suggestions Re: Chinook Notes

Hello Malcolm/Joelle: As promised, attached you will find in Word our recommended changes and comments to contextualize the input. Word was easier to work in than the Excel spreadsheet. Note that we have provided in some cases multiple potential responses for what was a single response ground in Chinook. We are hoping that it is possible to build in !

I have copied our DLSU Chinook contacts and also taken the liberty to copy IPG, since they are interested in making changes to TR refusal grounds in GCMS and would like these to align with Chinook. Please let us know if you have further questions in relation to this document.

Cheers,

Gary Taljit

Litigation Analyst, Case Management
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Gary.Taljit@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 613-437-7355

Analyste de litiges, Règlement des cas

Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Gary.Taljit@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 613-437-7355

s.23

Davidson.Ray

From: Campbell.Malcolm
Sent: September 26, 2019 2:03 PM
To: Nanavati.Taralee; Parnham.Carina;
Cc: @international.gc.ca'; Belair.Marjolaine; Hickey.Donna
Subject: RE: litigation case

Hi Carina,

Thanks for the meeting yesterday.

For general best practices, I can:

- Remind officers of the Edit function if they want to add specific application reasons,
- Remind officers not to use the bulk bona fides note generator if the reasons don't apply to their applications, and
- Suggest officers write individual notes for any previously refused application that was litigated and sent back to the office for a redetermination,
- Anything I missed?

And I'll await any suggestions for improvement on wording for " " and any other refinements or breakdowns of " " you may have and share with the Chinook team for review.

But as discussed, I think the " " s a bigger issue that IPG also have to be involved in to provide field guidance and update the refusal letter which your team mentioned they are in the midst of doing but with long timelines..

Thanks
Malcolm

From: Nanavati.Taralee
Sent: September 25, 2019 12:30 PM
To: Parnham.Carina ; Campbell.Malcolm ; 
Cc: @international.gc.ca'; Belair.Marjolaine
Subject: RE: litigation case

Hello
Attached is the latest exchange I had on this.
Thanks.

Taralee Nanavati

Litigation Analyst, Case Management
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Taralee.Nanavati@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 613-437-6582

Analyste des litiges, Règlement des cas
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Taralee.Nanavati@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 613-437-6582

From: Parnham.Carina
Sent: September 25, 2019 12:23 PM
To: Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>; @international.gc.ca;
 Nanavati.Taralee <Taralee.Nanavati@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: @international.gc.ca; Belair.Marjolaine <Marjolaine.Belair@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: Re: litigation case

Hi Malcolm,

This would be IPG's role. We have flagged but don't lead on the PDI's though always happy to be consulted.

Carina

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

From: Campbell.Malcolm
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2019 11:01 AM
To: Parnham.Carina; Nanavati.Taralee
Cc: 'Jacqueline.Kalisz@international.gc.ca'; Belair.Marjolaine
Subject: RE: litigation case

Okay, thanks Carina.

Any update from IPG on when they will remove that refusal ground from the refusal letter?

And will your team be providing updated PDIs about this for officers or would this be IPG as well?

Thanks
 Malcolm

From: Parnham.Carina
Sent: September 25, 2019 10:04 AM
To: Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>; @international.gc.ca;
 Nanavati.Taralee <Taralee.Nanavati@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Kalisz.Jacqueline <Jacqueline.Kalisz@cic.gc.ca>; Belair.Marjolaine <Marjolaine.Belair@cic.gc.ca>
Subject: Re: litigation case

Hello Malcolm,

I believe that we did advise in February that since the case law is quite clear that [REDACTED] is at most a neutral factor, [REDACTED] should not be used as a refusal ground. At the time we were told that this would be removed as a refusal ground. It would be helpful for the defensibility of decisions if [REDACTED] was no longer used as a refusal ground.

Thanks.

Carina

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

From: Campbell.Malcolm

s.17

s.23

Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2019 9:57 AM
To: [\[REDACTED\]](#); Nanavati.Taralee; Parnham.Carina
Cc: I Belair.Marjolaine; Parnham.Carina
Subject: RE: litigation case

Hi Carina,

For our meeting this afternoon.

I don't think we ever received a response on this about the tick box.

Thanks
Malcolm

From: [\[REDACTED\]](#)

Sent: February 21, 2019 1:37 PM

To: Nanavati.Taralee <Taralee.Nanavati@cic.gc.ca>; Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>
Cc: Kalisz.Jacqueline <Jacqueline.Kalisz@cic.gc.ca>; Sanan.Sunil <Sunil.Sanan@cic.gc.ca>; Belair.Marjolaine <Marjolaine.Belair@cic.gc.ca>; Parnham.Carina <Carina.Parnham@cic.gc.ca>

Subject: Re: litigation case

Hi Taralee

In this instance, the officer's reasoning in the refusal notes is that, having acknowledged that the applicant has some , then states that the 1

However, it seems to me that the issue is with the refusal letter where the discounted positive factor has now incorrectly become a ground for refusal (i.e. a negative factor). The problem is that the refusal letters are generated by GCMS this way: officers don't have control over that if they select as one of the factors that they considered.

Would you agree that officers should desist from selecting in GCMS as a refusal ground?

Cheers

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

From: Nanavati.Taralee
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:25 PM
To: Campbell.Malcolm
Cc: Sanan.Sunil; -ANKRA -IM; Belair.Marjolaine; Parnham.Carina
Subject: FW: litigation case

Hi Malcolm

The litigation analyst that was assigned to the case is currently out of the office. I'm including her in the cc in case she wants to add anything upon her return. I believe the case that was referred to yesterday was this one:

Caselaw:

Let me know if you need anything further.
Thanks.

Taralee Nanavati

Litigation Analyst, Case Management
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada / Government of Canada
Taralee.Nanavati@cic.gc.ca / Tel: 613-437-6582

Analyste des litiges, Règlement des cas
Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada / Gouvernement du Canada
Taralee.Nanavati@cic.gc.ca / Tél.: 613-437-6582

From: Campbell.Malcolm <Malcolm.Campbell@cic.gc.ca>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 11:02 AM

To: Parnham.Carina
Cc: Sanan.Sunil
Subject: litigation case

Hi Carina,

s.23

You mentioned yesterday at our Chinook demo that there was a recent litigation case that cited both positive and negative [REDACTED] as a refusal element and that the wording sounded illogical. We'd like to see if the notes did come from our refusal note generator.

Could you share that case with us if possible for review?

You also mentioned that citing [REDACTED] in notes was not viewed well by judges recently. Do you have any suggestions on how to word previous [REDACTED] as a positive and a negative factor?

Thanks, will respond to your other document with comments on that original email thread.

Malcolm Campbell
Strategic Planning and Delivery | Planification stratégique et exécution
International Network | Réseau international
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada | Immigration, Réfugiés et Citoyenneté Canada
Government of Canada | Gouvernement du Canada
malcolm.campbell@cic.gc.ca